



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.     | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/688,614          | 10/17/2003  | Kelcy L. Warren      | ETG:1003            | 2439             |
| 34725               | 7590        | 09/18/2008           |                     |                  |
| CHALKER FLORES, LLP |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| 2711 LBJ FRWY       |             |                      | BORISSOV, IGOR N    |                  |
| Suite 1036          |             |                      |                     |                  |
| DALLAS, TX 75234    |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                     |             |                      | 3628                |                  |
|                     |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                     |             |                      | 09/18/2008          | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/688,614

**Applicant(s)**

WARREN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Igor N. Borissov

**Art Unit**

3628

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-30, 33-66 and 69-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-29, 50-65 and 85-94 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-19, 30, 33-49, 66, 69-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Amendment received on 05/12/2008 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 20-29, 50-65, 85-94 have been withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 31-32, 67-68 have been canceled. Claims 1, 30, 66 have been amended. Claims 1, 4-30, 33-66, 69-94 are currently pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 4-19, 30, 33-49, 66, 69-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mistr, Jr. (US 6,153,943) in view of Aasen et al. (US 4,802,100).**

Mistr, Jr. teaches a method, system and a computer-readable medium having instructions embedded therein for causing a computer to implement said method for selecting a power source to a device, comprising:

Claims 1, 30 and 66,

(a) analyzing market and operational data related to the two or more available power sources, and the device or delivery point (C. 13, L. 6-11, 21, 31-32; C. 17, L. 12-14); wherein the two or more available power sources are connected to the device or delivery point via one or more switches or couplings;

(b) selecting the power source for the device or delivery point from the two or more available power sources based on a set of financial parameters (C. 13, L. 37-40);

(c) whenever the device or delivery point is not already connected to the selected power source, determining whether it is profitable to switch the device or delivery point

to the selected power source (based on historical operating data, current operating data, contract data, market data and financial data), sending one or more signals to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source (operating system by a computer in an automatic mode indicates "signal" feature; C. 13, L. 37-44).

Mistr, Jr. does not specifically teach determining whether a user has overridden switching the device or delivery point to the selected power source; and that said sending one or more signals to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source is conducted whenever the user has not overridden switching the device or delivery point to the selected power source.

Aasen et al. teaches a method and system for selecting a power source to a device, comprising: (a) analyzing market and operational data related to the two or more available power sources, and the device or delivery point; (b) selecting the power source for the device or delivery point from the two or more available power sources based on a set of financial parameters; and (c) sending one or more signals to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source whenever the device or delivery point is not already connected to the selected power source, wherein system control can be implemented via a manual mode, thereby suggesting "overridden" feature (C. 6, L. 27-35; C. 10, L. 55-59; C. 15, L. 58 - C. 16, L. 22).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mistr, Jr. to include determining whether a user has overridden switching the device or delivery point to the selected power source, as suggested in Aasen et al., because it would advantageously allow to reprogram the system for business benefit. Furthermore, in this case, each of the elements of the cited references combined by the Examiner performs the same function when combined as it does in the prior art. Thus, such a combination would have yielded predictable results. See *Sakraida*, 425 U.S. at 282, 189 USPQ at 453. Therefore, Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (KSR, 82 USPQ2d at 1396) forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See the recent Board decision *Ex arte Smith*, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007).

Claims 4, 33 and 69. Aasen et al. teaches updating a display (Fig. 3).

Claims 5, 18, 19, 34-36 and 70. Mistr, Jr. teaches receiving market and operational data related to the two or more available power sources, and the device or delivery point (C. 13, L. 6-11, 21, 31-32; C. 17, L. 12-14).

Claims 6 and 71. Mistr, Jr. teaches repeating steps (a), (b) and (c) (monitoring said market and operational data in real time indicates "repeating" feature; C. 13, L. 31-37).

Claims 7, 8, 37, 38, 72 and 73. Mistr, Jr. teaches repeating steps (a), (b) and (c) (monitoring and calculating in real time), thereby suggesting that said repeating of said steps is conducted periodically. The motivation to modify the reference would be to employ the low cost slow processors and network connection.

Claims 9-12, 39-42, 74-77. Mistr, Jr. teaches said method and system, wherein the market and operational data is selected from the group consisting of historical operating data, current operating data, contract data, market data and financial data.

Claims 13, 43 and 78. Aasen et al. teaches that the one or more signals are manually sent or implemented.

Claims 14, 44 and 79. Mistr, Jr. teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the delivery point is an electrical connection to an electricity customer or a redelivery point to an electrical network (paying for electricity suggests customer relationship).

Claims 15, 45, 80. Mistr, Jr. teaches said method and system, wherein the one or more available power sources is an electricity source selected from the group consisting

of one or more electrical network connections, one or more combustion turbine generators, one or more steam turbine generators, one or more batteries, one or more fuel cells, one or more solar cells, one or more wind generators, one or more biomass generators and one or more hydroelectric generators.

Claims 16, 46 and 81. Mith, Jr. suggests that the one or more available power sources is a mechanical source selected from the group consisting of one or more engines, one or more motors, one or more motor/generators and one or more turbines.

Claims 17, 47 and 82. Mith, Jr. suggests that the device is selected from the group consisting of a compressor and a pump.

Claims 18, 19, 48, 49, 83 and 84. Mith, Jr. suggests multi-source systems.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 05/12/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach or suggest:

"determining (i) whether it is profitable to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source based on a projected potential revenue and a projected cost associated with switching to the selected power source, a time period and one or more guidelines and (ii) whether a user has overridden switching the device or delivery point to the selected power source", and "sending one or more signals to the one or more switches or couplings to electrically or physically switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source whenever it is profitable to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source and the user has not overridden switching the device or delivery point to the selected power source".

In response to this argument it is noted that Mist, Jr. discloses that whenever the device or delivery point is not already connected to the selected power source, determining whether it is profitable to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source (based on historical operating data, current operating data, contract data, market data and financial data), sending one or more signals to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source (operating system by a computer in an automatic mode indicates "signal" feature). Specifically, Mist, Jr. teaches (C. 13, L. 37-44):

...should the computer indicate that a first energy supplier 72 is offering power at rates that are less than a second energy supplier 84, the system can acquire power from that supplier without the energy storage apparatus being online. Should the cost become sufficiently less economical, the present invention can bring the system online to provide supplementary or substitute electric power.

As per "overridden" feature per se, Aasen et al. was applied for this feature. Specifically, Aasen et al. teaches: (a) analyzing market and operational data related to the two or more available power sources, and the device or delivery point; (b) selecting the power source for the device or delivery point from the two or more available power sources based on a set of financial parameters; and (c) sending one or more signals to switch the device or delivery point to the selected power source whenever the device or delivery point is not already connected to the selected power source, wherein system control can be implemented via a manual mode, thereby suggesting "overridden" feature (C. 6, L. 27-35; C. 10, L. 55-59; C. 15, L. 58 - C. 16, L. 22).

Applicant argues that Mist, Jr. fails to teach or suggest: "switching the device or delivery point to the selected power source based on a projected potential revenue and a projected cost associated with switching to the selected power source, a time period and one or more guidelines".

In response to this argument it is noted that Mist, Jr. discloses that switching decision is based on historical operating data, current operating data, contract data, market data and financial data, thereby suggesting said features.

Applicant argues that modifying Mistr, Jr. to perform the steps recited in claims 1, 30 and 66 would change the Mistr's principle of operation. However, Applicant did not pointed out which operation will be changed, how and why. Accordingly, the examiner cannot provide a response to this argument.

The remaining applicant's arguments essentially repeat the arguments presented above; therefore, the responses presented by the examiner above are equally applicable to the remaining applicant's arguments.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Igor N. Borissov/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628

09/15/2008